



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/160,424

09/25/1998

SCOT L. SCHNEEBELI

1215

6327

21396

7590

07/25/2008

Sprint

6391 SPRINT PARKWAY

KSOPHT0101-Z2100

OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER

FORD, GRANT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/160,424  
Filing Date: September 25, 1998  
Appellant(s): SCHNEEBELI ET AL.

---

Mark C. Young  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/5/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/1/2006.

Application/Control Number:  
09/160,424  
Art Unit: 2141

Page 2

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,026,371	Beck et al.	2-2000
6,182,111	Inohara et al.	1-2001
5,806,075	Jain et al.	9-1998
6,026,371	Chang et al.	10-2000

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-2,6,9, 14-16,27,30-31,34,37, 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck et al. with Patent Number 6,026,371 in view of Inohara et al. with Patent Number 6,182,111.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 51, Beck teaches production servers as "at least one database server", col. 1-2, lines 67-1 that provide production content to content users of a computer network in response to requests to route to the production server from the content users, col. 2, lines 47-50, 57-60. Beck teaches a staging server that is connected to the first and second production servers, wherein staging content is generated, edited and/or tested on the staging server, col. 3, lines 28-30 by an administrator as "a business or

organization wishing to preview their customized multimedia advertisement material can select to have this material imported to the staging database", col. 3, lines 32-35 which inherently means access is limited to said "business or organization" that can review their proprietary content, wherein said "business or organization" is assuming the role of an administrator to "review", col. 3, line 48 and as applicant's specification describes prior art legacy firewall systems with their access levels as Raptor Eagle Software, pg. 8, line 5 edit or test content, col. 3, lines 39-42 wherein the staging content is automatically transferred from the staging server to the first and second production servers for publication on the first and second servers, col. 3, lines 10-12,49-50. Beck teaches in response to a publish command, col. 6, line 49 received on the staging server, col. 4, lines 6-10, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, col. 4, lines 18-19. Beck teaches wherein the transferred staging content replaces the production content on the production server such that the transferred content becomes subsequent production content accessible by the content users of the computer network, col. 2, lines 57-60. Beck teaches replicating the staging content to at least first and second temporary directories, col. 3, lines 29-32,46.

Beck teaches the invention in the above claims except for explicitly teaching a transferring content at substantially the same time to more than one production server.

In that Beck operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing

system. In that art, Inohara, a related network content provider, teaches "this necessary data may be cached at two or more second servers among a plurality of servers", col. 5-6, lines 66-1 in order to provide data. Inohara specifically teaches "a request is transmitted at the same time to a plurality of servers", col. 14, lines 22-24; but also "coherence of caches" by "multicasting", col. 3, lines 34-36; col. 4, lines 27; and "news is copied to all servers", col. 4, line 57; "list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more servers", col. 6, lines 46-47, 55-64; col. 8, lines 40-47; as "inter-server message", col. 22, lines 36-39, 57-19; and col. 23, lines 38-40. Further, Inohara suggests that "the first server transmits part or whole of a list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more second servers", col. 6, lines 45-47 which will result from implementing publish commands.

The motivation to incorporate sending data to multiple servers at substantially the same time via a standard multicast command insures that data redundancy is timely maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incomplete simultaneous data updates as taught in Beck into the publisher described in Inohara because Inohara operates with network content and Beck suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content.

Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claims 30, Beck teaches a staging server that is connected to the first and second production servers, col. 3, lines 28-30; limiting access to the staging server such that the server is not accessible by content

users of the computer network as "a business or organization wishing to preview their customized multimedia advertisement material can select to have this material imported to the staging database", col. 3, lines 32-35 which inherently means access is limited to said "business or organization" that can review their proprietary content, wherein said "business or organization" is assuming the role of the first access level, col. 3, line 48; restricting access to the staging server in response to a command associated with the first access level as "review", col. 3, line 48, "preview their customized" content, col. 3, line 33, and as applicant's specification describes prior art legacy firewall systems with their access levels as Raptor Eagle Software, pg. 8, line 5; staging content is automatically transferred from the staging server to the first and second production servers for publication on the first and second servers, col. 3, lines 10-12,49-50 in response to a publish command, col. 6, line 49 received on the staging server, col. 4, lines 6-10, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, col. 4, lines 18-19. Beck teaches restricting the automatic transfer of staging content in response to a command associated with a second access level, col. 6, lines 20,49.

Beck teaches the invention in the above claims except for explicitly teaching a transferring content at substantially the same time to more than one production server.

In that Beck operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing system. In that art, Inohara, a related network content provider, teaches "this



necessary data may be cached at two or more second servers among a plurality of servers", col. 5-6, lines 66-1 in order to provide data. Inohara specifically teaches "a request is transmitted at the same time to a plurality of servers", col. 14, lines 22-24; but also "coherence of caches" by "multicasting", col. 3, lines 34-36; col. 4, lines 27; and "news is copied to all servers", col. 4, line 57; "list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more servers", col. 6, lines 46-47, 55-64; col. 8, lines 40-47; as "inter-server message", col. 22, lines 36-39, 57-19; and col. 23, lines 38-40. Further, Inohara suggests that "the first server transmits part or whole of a list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more second servers", col. 6, lines 45-47 which will result from implementing publish commands.

The motivation to incorporate sending data to multiple servers at substantially the same time via a standard multicast command insures that data redundancy is timely maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious- to one of ordinary skill in the art to incomplete simultaneous data updates as taught in Beck into the publisher described in Inohara because Inohara operates with network content and Beck suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content.

Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claims 37, Beck teaches a staging server that is connected to the first and second production servers, wherein staging content is generated, edited and/or tested on the staging server, col. 3, lines 28-30; limiting access to the staging server such that the server is not accessible by content

users of the computer network as "a business or organization wishing to preview their customized multimedia advertisement material can select to have this material imported to the staging database", col. 3, lines 32-35 which inherently means access is limited to said "business or organization" that can review their proprietary content, wherein said "business or organization" is assuming the role of the first access level, col. 3, line 48; staging content is generated, edited and/or tested on the staging server, col. 3, lines 28-30; a firewall restricting access to the staging server in response to a command associated with the first access level as "review", col. 3, line 48, "preview their customized" content, col. 3, line 33 and ccauthorization", col. 6, line 49 and as applicant's specification describes prior art legacy firewall systems with their access levels as Raptor Eagle Software, pg. 8, line 5; staging content is automatically transferred from the staging server to the first and second production servers for publication on the first and second servers, col. 3, lines 10-12,49-50 in response to a publish command, col. 6, line 49 received on the staging server, col. 4, lines 6-10, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, col. 4, lines 18-19. Beck teaches restricting the automatic transfer of staging content in response to a command associated with a second access level, col. 6, lines 20,49.

Beck teaches the invention in the above claims except for explicitly teaching a transferring content at substantially the same time to more than one production server.

In that Beck operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing system. In that art, Inohara, a related network content provider, teaches "this necessary data may be cached at two or more second servers among a plurality of servers", col. 5-6, lines 66-1 in order to provide data. Inohara specifically teaches "a request is transmitted at the same time to a plurality of servers", col. 14, lines 22-24; but also "coherence of caches" by "multicasting", col. 3, lines 34-36; col. 4, lines 27; and "news is copied to all servers", col. 4, line 57; "list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more servers", col. 6, lines 46-47, 55-64; col. 8, lines 40-47; as "inter-server message", col. 22, lines 36-39, 57-19; and col. 23, lines 38-40. Further, Inohara suggests that "the first server transmits part or whole of a list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more second servers", col. 6, lines 45-47 which will result from implementing publish commands.

The motivation to incorporate sending data to multiple servers at substantially the same time via a standard multicast command insures that data redundancy is timely maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incomplete simultaneous data updates as taught in Beck into the publisher described in Inohara because Inohara operates with network content and Beck suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content.

Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claims 34, Beck teaches replacing staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, col. 4, lines 18-19. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claim(s) 2, 15, Beck teaches a file server for storing the staging content, col. 3, lines 14-15. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 16, Beck teaches storing on the fileserver before transferring data to the production server, col. 3, lines 28-29. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claims 6 and 31, Beck teaches adding or changing additional content, col. 3, lines 40-42. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 52, Beck teaches commanding publication as "authorization", col. 6, line 49. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 53-54, Beck teaches replicating content and verifying content, col. 3, lines 40-42. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Claims 38,41,43-44, 46, 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck et al. with Patent Number 6,026,371 in view of

Inohara et al. with Patent Number 6,182,111, and Jain et al. with Patent Number 5,806,075.

Regarding claims 41, and 46, Beck teaches production servers as "at least one database server", col. 1-2, lines 67-1 that provide production content to content users of a computer network in response to requests to route to the production server from the content users, col. 2, lines 47-50,57-60. Beck teaches a staging server that is connected to the first and second production servers, wherein the staging content is automatically transferred from the staging server to the first and second production servers for publication on the first and second servers, col. 3, lines 10-12,49-50. Beck teaches in response to a publish command, col. 6, line 49 received on the staging server, col. 4, lines 6-10, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, col. 4, lines 18-19. Beck teaches wherein the transferred staging content replaces the production content on the production server such that the transferred content becomes subsequent production content accessible by the content users of the computer network, col. 2, lines 57-60.

Beck teaches the invention in the above claims except for explicitly teaching a transferring content at substantially the same time to more than one production server, and replacing the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command.

In that Beck operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing system. In that art, Inohara, a related network content provider, teaches "this

necessary data ]nay be cached at two or more second servers among- a plurality of servers", col. 5-6, lines 66-1 in order to provide data. Inohara specifically teaches "a request is transmitted at the same time to a plurality of servers", col. 14, lines 22-24; but also "coherence of caches" by "multicasting", col. 3, lines 34-36; col. 4, lines 27; and "news is copied to all servers", col. 4, line 57; "list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more servers", col. 6, lines 46-47, 55-64; col. 8, lines 40-47; as "inter-server message", col. 22, lines 36-39, 57-19; and col. 23, lines 38-40. Further, Inohara suggests that "the first server transmits part or whole of a list of caches possessed by the first server to one or more second servers", col. 6, lines 45-47 which will result from implementing publish commands.

The motivation to incorporate sending data to multiple servers at substantially the same time via a standard multicast command insures that data redundancy is timely maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incomplete simultaneous data updates as taught in Beck into the publisher described in Inohara because Inohara operates with network content and Beck suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content.

The combination of Inohara and Beck teaches the invention in the above claims except for replacing the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command.

In that Beck and Inohara operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing

system. In that art, Jain, a related network content provider, teaches "duplicate copies of the same data may be resident at more than one location", col. 5, lines 13-15 in order to provide data. Jain specifically teaches "the ability to communicate an exception, to rollback any changes to a data copy", col. 22, lines 1-2.

Further, Jain suggests "the ability to identify conflicting modifications", col. 21, lines 62-63 which will result from implementing publish commands.

The motivation to incorporate replacing the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command insures that data is accurate. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command as taught in Jain into the publisher described in Beck and Inohara because Beck and Inohara operates with network content and Beck and Inohara suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content. Therefore, by the above rationale, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claim(s) 9, 27, 33, 38, Beck and Inohara teaches the invention in the above claims except for explicitly teaching replacing the content on the production servers in response to a rollback or replacement type command. In that Beck and Inohara operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing system. In that art, Jain, a related network content provider, teaches "duplicate copies of the same data may be resident at more than one location", col. 5, lines

13-15 in order to provide data. Jain specifically teaches "the ability to communicate an exception, to rollback any changes to a data copy", col. 22, lines 1-2. Further, Jain suggests "the ability to identify conflicting modifications", col. 21, lines 62-63 which will result from implementing publish commands. The motivation to incorporate replacing the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command insures that data redundancy is accurate. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the content on the production servers in response to a rollback command as taught in Jain into the publisher described in Beck and Inohara because Beck and Inohara operates with network content and Beck and Inohara suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claim(s) 43-44,48-49, Beck teaches limiting access to segments or "portions", col. 3, line 39 in the staging server such that the server is not accessible by content users of the computer network as "a business or organization wishing to preview their customized multimedia advertisement material can select to have this material imported to the staging database", col. 3, lines 32-35 which inherently means access is limited to said "business or organization" that can review their proprietary content, wherein said "business or organization" is assuming the role of the first access level, col. 3, line 48; a first access level as "review", col. 3, line 48, "preview their customized" content, col. 3, line 33 and "authorization", col. 6, line 49 and as applicant's specification



describes prior art legacy firewall systems with their access levels as Raptor Eagle Software, pg. 8, line 5. Beck teaches restricting the automatic transfer of staging content in response to a command associated with a second access level, col. 6, lines 20,

Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Claims 3-5, 7-8, 10-13, 17-22, 24-29, 35-36, 39-40,45, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck et al. with Patent Number 6,026,371 in view of Inohara et al. with Patent Number 6,182,111 and Chang et al. with Patent Number 6,134,584.

In view of the rejections of claims 1, 14, 30,37,41, and 46 regarding claims 7, 12,25, 29,36,40,45, 50, The combination of Beck and Inohara teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching a scheduling system. In that Beck operates to publish data, the artisan would have looked to the content network arts for details of implementing a publishing system. In that art, Chang, a related network content provider, teaches downloading of data, col. 5, lines 52-54 in order to provide data at a specified time. Chang specifically teaches "scheduling data download", col. 5, lines 59-63. Further, Chang suggests that "this invention includes the abilities of allowing the user to schedule data download from those web cites requiring user id and password", col. 6, lines 63-65 will result from implementing the scheduled publish

commands. The motivation to incorporate a data scheduling insures that data is timely sent. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the schedule system as taught in Chang into the publisher described in Beck and Inohara because Beck and Inohara operates with network content and Chang suggests that optimization can be obtained when publishing content. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claims are rejected.

Regarding claim(s) 3, 10, 17, 20-22, Change teaches a firewall to limit access to a staging server, the staging server is operable to prevent alteration, verify user access, and two access levels, and user security as "user id and password if required", col. 2, lines 11-13; col. 6, lines 15-17. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 4, 18, 35, 39, Change teaches segmenting of the staging content, and for a plurality of users or administrators as "individually", col. 6, line 25 or in Beck as processing for a plurality of servers, col. 1, line 67. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 5, 19, Beck teaches the same address with the staging and production servers as one database server for both, col. 2, lines 1-3. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claims 8, 12, 26, Change teaches canceling content delivery, col. 6, lines 47. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 11, 12, 28-29, 36, Change teaches providing information such as log files and status information, col. 6, line 46. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim 13, Inohara teaches a remote server, col. 8, lines 6-7. Thus, the above claim limitation is obvious in view of the combination.

Regarding claim(s) 24, Beck teaches requesting additional content as "select[ing]", col. 3, line 34. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

(A) As to group 1, appellant's arguments relate to limitations in independent claims 1,14,30,37, and 51.

(1) Appellant argues that neither Beck nor Inohara disclose or suggest the transfer of staging content from a staging server to first and second (or a plurality of) production servers for publication on the production servers at substantially the same time.

As to point (1), in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Appellants' argued limitation was rejected under the prior art combination of Inohara with Beck. With

regard to appellants' argued limitation, the prior art of Beck was relied upon for disclosing transferring staging content from a staging server to a production server (Col. 3 lines 10-12 and 49-50). The prior art of Inohara was relied upon for teaching the publishing of data to multiple servers simultaneously including the use of multicasting for data redundancy (Col. 3 lines 34-36, Col. 4 lines 27 and 57, Col. 6 lines 46-47 and 55-64, Col. 8 lines 40-47, and Col. 23 lines 38-40). Appellants' argument is not found to be persuasive as it argues against the references individually where the rejection of the argued limitation is based on a combination of references.

Regarding Appellants' assertion that the prior art of Inohara fails to teach or suggest publication "at substantially the same time", Inohara discloses that "a request is transmitted at the same time to a plurality of servers" via multicast and broadcast means at Col 3 lines 23-30, Col 4 lines 24-30, Col. 14 lines 22-24. As understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, the use of multicast and broadcast means for transmission to multiple recipients is by nature "substantially at the same time."

Appellant argued that the instant invention provides that staging content is transferred and stored in a temporary directory at each production area, and that executing a "publish" command starts, at each production area, a content replication daemon that copies the content from the temporary directory of each production area to the publication directory at each production area. Appellant argued that the daemon publishes the staging content by copying it from the temporary directory to the publication directory. In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a daemon initiated at each production area which when a publish command starts (at each production area), copies the content from the temporary directory of each production area to the publication directory at each production area) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Appellants appear to assert a special meaning of "publication" in the instant specification at page 14 lines 10-12 of the instant Appeal Brief. However, the term "publication" has been afforded its broadest reasonable interpretation based upon definition in view of no such special definition found within the instant specification. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that by definition, publication occurs when information is brought to public attention. The prior art of Beck discloses customizing multimedia advertisements through the use of a staging database 27. After completing review of the advertisements, the associated web pages are exported from the replica staging database to the production database for presentation to end users (Col. 3 lines 16-35 and 46-50).

(2) Appellant argues that neither Beck nor Inohara disclose how one goes about achieving simultaneous publication, and that the prior art combination is based upon impermissible hindsight.

As to point (2), Appellant argues that neither Beck and/or Inohara address the problem of simultaneous publication of content across multiple production servers as solved by the instant invention. Appellant argues that there is nothing in either reference, or in their combination, as to how one would go about achieving such simultaneous publication. The prior art of Beck discloses publication of web-based advertisements through the use of a staging database and a production database (Abstract). However, the prior art of Beck fails to explicitly disclose transferring content at substantially the same time to more than one production server. Inohara is directed to a distributed network content system and teaches the use of multicast/broadcast transmissions with regard to caching data at two or more second servers among a plurality of servers in order to provide data, as well as maintaining coherency between said plurality of servers (Col. 3 lines 34-36, Col. 4 lines 27 and 57, Col 5 line 66 through Col 6 line 1, Col. 6 lines 46-47 and 55-64, Col. 8 lines 40-47, Col. 22 lines 36-39, and Col. 23 lines 38-40). One of ordinary skill in the art would have looked to the prior art teachings of Inohara for the implementation of sending data to multiple servers at substantially the same time via broadcast/multicast with the prior art publication system of Beck for the purpose of implementing simultaneous data updates across multiple production servers as cited in the Non-Final Rejection dated 11/1/2006.

(3) Appellant argues that Beck and Inohara do not either alone or in combination disclose or suggest limiting access to a staging server, wherein a

first user associated with a first access level is allowed to control generation of staging content, and wherein a second user associated with a second access level is allowed to control the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers, as claimed in independent claims 30 and 37.

As to point (3), Beck discloses limiting access to the staging server such that the server is not accessible by content users of the computer network as "a business or organization wishing to preview their customized multimedia advertisement material can select to have this material imported to the staging database", col. 3, lines 32-35 which inherently means access is limited to said "business or organization" that can review their proprietary content, wherein said "business or organization" is assuming the role of the first access level, col. 3, line 48; staging content is generated, edited and/or tested on the staging server, col. 3, lines 28-30; a firewall restricting access to the staging server in response to a command associated with the first access level as "review", col. 3, line 48, "preview their customized" content, col. 3, line 33 and ccauthorization", col. 6, line 49 and as applicant's specification describes prior art legacy firewall systems with their access levels as Raptor Eagle Software, pg. 8, line 5. Beck further teaches restricting the automatic transfer of staging content in response to a command associated with a second access level at Col. 6 lines 20 and 49, as claimed in independent claims 30 and 37. As such, Appellant's argument is not found to be persuasive.

(B) As to group 2, appellant's arguments relate to limitations in independent claims 41 and 46.

(1) Appellant argued that while the prior art of Jain was cited as teaching the "rollback" limitation of claims 41 and 46, Jain fails to remedy the alleged deficiencies addressed with respect to arguments directed to independent claims 1, 14, 30, 37, and 51.

As to point (1), as Appellant's argument is addressed at group (A) above.



**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Ford

/G. F./

Examiner, Art Unit 2141

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142

Conferees:

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145